


### REMARKS

In the Office action dated March 24, 2010, Claims 11, 13-17, 19, and 20 are pending. Claims 11, 13, 17, 19, and 20 stand rejected. Claims 11, 13, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kelly, U.S. Patent No. 6,220,569. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Ueda et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,085,921. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to Claims 11, 13, 17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) because Kelly does not teach or suggest each and every element of the limitations as recited in Claims 11, 13, 17, 19, and 20. For example, Kelly does not teach or suggest *a first guide spring having a second sealing surface, said first guide spring located between said plunger and said orifice member* as recited in Claim 11 (emphasis added) and illustrated in Figure 2 of Applicants' disclosure. In rejecting the above limitation, the Office Action on page 2 equates *a first guide spring* to Kelly's element 26 (spider-like spring element), *said plunger* to Kelly's element 32 (an elastomeric port sealing member), and *said orifice member* to Kelly's port element 15. However, as illustrated below in Kelly's Figures 1 and 2, Kelly's element 26 (i.e., the spider-like spring element) is not located between Kelly's element 32 and Kelly's port element 15.



As clearly indicated above, in a zoomed in portion of Kelly's Figure 2 with extraneous numbering removed for clarity, the spider-like spring element 26 is located above or at best beside the elastomeric port sealing member 32, and is not located *between* the elastomeric port sealing member

32 and the port element 15. As stated in Applicants' disclosure, this design yields several advantages. For example, two planar surfaces contacting each other virtually eliminates any issues of non-parallelism between the sealing surfaces. Two parallel lapped surfaces contacting each other yields very low leak rate values. The lapped sealing surfaces along with the controlled downward force reduce seat and orifice deformation when cycling the valve open and closed. This reduces particle generation that accompanies metal deformation. For at least the above reasons, Kelly does not teach or suggest each and every element of the limitations as recited in Claim 11.

In addition, the Office Action fails to show that Kelly teaches or suggests that *said first guide spring located between said plunger and said orifice member and secured to said plunger distal end* as recited in Claim 11 (emphasis added). In contrast to Claim 11, the Office Action on page 2 asserts that Kelly's spider-like spring element 26 has "a portion attached to a first end of the *pole* [51]" instead of Kelly's element 32 (an elastomeric port sealing member), which the Office Action equates to Applicants claimed *plunger*. For this additional reason, the Office Action has not established that Kelly teaches or suggests each and every element of the limitations as recited in Claim 11.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Kelly does not anticipate Claim 11. Kelly also does not anticipate independent Claim 17 for at least the same or similar reasons as presented above with regard to Claim 11. Claims 13-16, 19, and 20 are also not anticipated at least by virtue of their respective dependency on Claims 11 and 17.

In view of the above arguments, Applicants respectfully request the rejection to Claims 11, 13-17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 14-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on Claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, respectfully request the allowance thereof. If, however, the Examiner should for any reason consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this request. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 19-3140, under Order No. 11000054-0033 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 21, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Nam H. Huynh/  
Nam Huynh  
Registration No.: 60,703  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
2000 McKinney Avenue, Suite 1900  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(214) 259-0971  
(214) 259-0910 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant